

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

YARBOROUGH,

Plaintiff,

-against-

BRAGG ET AL.,

Defendants.

25-cv-00159 (DEH)

ORDER

DALE E. HO, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, has filed an emergency motion requesting a temporary restraining order. “It is well established that in this Circuit the standard for an entry of a TRO is the same as for a preliminary injunction.” *Andino v. Fischer*, 555 F. Supp. 2d 418, 419 (S.D.N.Y. 2008). To obtain such relief, Plaintiff must show: (1) that she is likely to suffer irreparable harm and (2) either (a) a likelihood of success on the merits of her case or (b) sufficiently serious questions going to the merits to make them a fair ground for litigation and a balance of hardships tipping decidedly in her favor. *See UBS Fin. Servs., Inc. v. W.V. Univ. Hosps., Inc.*, 660 F.3d 643, 648 (2d Cir. 2011) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted); *Wright v. Giuliani*, 230 F.3d 543, 547 (2000). “[A] TRO, perhaps even more so than a preliminary injunction, is an ‘extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.’” *Free Country Ltd v. Drennen*, 235 F. Supp. 3d 559, 565 (S.D.N.Y. 2016) (quoting *JBR, Inc. v. Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.*, 618 Fed.Appx. 31, 33 (2d Cir. 2015)).

Plaintiff’s submissions do not demonstrate: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits, or (2) sufficiently serious questions going to the merits to make them a fair ground for litigation and

a balance of hardships tipping decidedly in her favor. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for an order to show cause (ECF No. 5) is DENIED.

### CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's request for an order to show cause (ECF No. 5) is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate ECF No. 5.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff and note service on the docket.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 10, 2025  
New York, New York



---

DALE E. HO  
United States District Judge